UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,175	09/12/2003	Clarence E. Thomas	068062.0168	7513
31625 BAKER BOTT	7590 02/26/200 S L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
PATENT DEPA		LEE, HWA S		
98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500 AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039		000	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2886	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/661,175	THOMAS ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Hwa S. Lee (Andrew)	2886				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 De</u>	ecember 2008					
•	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
٥/ك	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
	·	A parto Quayro, 1000 0.5. 11, 10	0.0.210.				
Dispositi	on of Claims						
-	Claim(s) <u>1-8,10-12,33 and 34</u> is/are pending in						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8, 10-12, 33, and 34</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce	epted or b)□ objected to by the E	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice (3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 10-12, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aziz et al (US 5,640,270).

For claims 1 and 8, Aziz et al (Aziz hereinafter) show interferometric apparatus and method comprising:

an illumination lens (22) operable to focus a reference beam;

a beam splitter (24) optically coupled to the illumination lens by the reference beam; and

a reference mirror (26) located at a waist of the reference beam and optically coupled to

the illumination lens via the beam splitter such that the reference beam is reflected from the

reference mirror to the beam splitter.

Although Aziz may not <u>expressly</u> state the functional use of the elements, such as the use of word "operable", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a <u>structural difference</u> between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably

Art Unit: 2886

distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. As presently claimed, there is no structural difference.

With regards to the limitation "to eliminate the need for a reference objective on a reference arm," that limitation does not further define the <u>structure</u> of the holography system. In addition the <u>intention</u> of using a reference mirror to eliminate the need for a reference objective does not further define the <u>structure</u> of the system. Aziz shows a structure of an illumination lens, a beam splitter, and a reference mirror located at a waist of the reference beam and oriented relative to the beam splitter and the illuminating lens such that the reference beam is reflected from the reference mirror to the lens and then to the beam splitter.

With regards to the method claim 8, "eliminating the need for..." only states the achievement of the invention which is not a method step. Therefore, there is no difference to the steps of claim 8 which is drawn to a method. Aziz shows the step of focusing a reference beam with an illumination lens, the step of transmitting at least a portion of the reference beam though a beam splitter, and the step of reflecting the portion of the reference beam.

With regards to claim 2, Aziz shows the beam splitter to be a cube beam splitter.

With respect to claim 3, Official Notice is taken than the use of quarter wave plates in an arm of an interferometer is well know. Interferometers utilizing polarized light is advantageous for improving signal quality by improving the difference between the measurement and reference beams, and the use of a quarter wave plate is known so that the reference beam will match the

measurement beam. A half wave shift is required to interfere and by using a quarterwave plate the reference beam having gone through the quarterwave plate twice (once to the reference mirror, and once returning from the reference mirror) will under a half wave shift such that the polarization matches the measurement beam.

.

With respect to claims 4 and 12, Aziz does not expressly show the beams are Gaussian. Aziz however teaches the system is able to use phase-shifting interferometry (column 3, lines 26+), and Official Notice is taken that it is well known to use a laser for it's coherent properties in phase-shifting interferometry. Furthermore, Official Notice is taken that lasers having a Gaussian pattern is well known and readily available. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have used a laser having a Gaussian pattern since they are readily available and would have used the laser for phase shifting interferometry as suggested by Aziz.

With regards to claim 5, Aziz shows the reference mirror comprises a flat mirror.

With regards to claims 6 and 11, Aziz shows the reference mirror operable to maintain optical symmetry of a reference arm and a target arm.

With regards to claims 7 and 10, the reference mirror would be inherently operable to form a first wavefront substantially similar to a second wavefront formed by the reference objective.

With respect to claim 33, the claim does not further limit claim 8 drawn to a method by reciting a <u>step</u> or manipulatively further defining a previously recited step. The claim merely recites a capability ("operable to") of the reference mirror, and thus Aziz meets the limitation of claim 33.

With respect to claim 34, the claim does not further limit claim 8, which is drawn to a method, by reciting a <u>step</u> or manipulatively further defining a previously recited step. The claim merely recites the structure of the reference mirror, and thus Aziz meets the limitation of claim 34.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 10-12, 33, and 34 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Application/Control Number: 10/661,175 Page 6

Art Unit: 2886

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Hwa S. Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-2419. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue-Fr.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tarifur R. Chowdhury can be reached on 571-272-2800. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/661,175

Page 7

Art Unit: 2886